

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 7-14, 16, 19, 21-26, 28-34 are amended. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-14, 16, 19, 21-26 and 28-32 are amended to further clarify the recited features. Support for the amendments to claims 33 and 34 can be found in the specification, for example, at paragraph [0076]. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Deane in the April 17, 2008 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. As agreed during the personal interview, the Examiner will not issue a Final Rejection in response to this Amendment because the Office Action did not fully address all of the features of pending claims.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's acknowledgment of the Applicant's claim for foreign priority.

The Office Action rejects claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §101. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 33 and 34 are amended and are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that there is no discussion in the current specification for the previously claimed "disconnection unit." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this allegation. For example, the specification, in paragraphs [0086], [0139] and [0149] discusses in detail the control unit, which corresponds to the previously claimed "disconnection unit." Notwithstanding the above arguments, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 10-13, 16, 19, 21-24, 26, 29, 31 and 31, are amended by changing the "disconnection unit" to the "control unit" for consistency, as

suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-34 for lack of antecedent basis. Claims 1, 5, 16, 23 and 26 are amended for antecedent basis. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,953,322 to Kimball in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,407 to Zhang et al. (hereinafter Zhang). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the April 17, 2008 personal interview, neither Kimball nor Zhang discloses a disconnection unit for disconnecting the line to the other party's telephone terminal through the telephone line network when a predetermined disconnection condition is satisfied, as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 23.

The Office Action, citing Fig. 1 of Kimball, alleges that the communications network 100 of Kimball corresponds to the claimed control unit, as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 23. The Office Action also appears to allege that the communication network 100 of Kimball is configured to be a Network Control Unit (NCU). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Kimball fails to disclose or suggest that the communications network 100 disconnects the line to another party's telephone when a predetermined condition. Further, Applicant submits that the communication network 100 of Kimball is not an NCU as alleged by the Office Action. Moreover, Applicant submits that Kimball fails to disclose or suggest any element that can reasonably be considered to correspond to the claimed control unit that disconnects the line to another party's telephone terminal through the telephone network when a predetermined disconnection condition is

satisfied, as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 23. Additionally, Applicant submits that Zhang fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kimball.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 12 and 23 are patentable over the combination of Kimball and Zhang. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-11, 13-22 and 24-32 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 12 and 23, from which these claims variously depend, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.  
Registration No. 61,310

JAO:LXF/jls

Date: April 25, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461